

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended and claims 7 and 8 have been added. It is submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 27, 2008.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

**Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (USP 7,177,523) in view of Okabayashi et al. (USP 6,751,399).**

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1, as amended, now recites the claimed features of “*an issuer for issuing the image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period, such that only in a case of shortening the image reproducing period, the image is renewed in response to the issue of the image renewal instruction.*” Independent claim 6 has been amended to recite similar features.

This Amendment is supported by the specification (page 2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph).

In the present claimed invention, the first reproducer renews the image every time the timer elapses (for example, as described in page 7, lines 5-12 of the specification).

In addition to the first reproducer, the second reproducer renews the image, without waiting for a lapse of the timer, every time the image renewal instruction is issued (for example, as described in page 7, lines 13-21 of the specification). In other words, the second reproducer is activated by the image renewal instruction issued by the issuer. When the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period, the issuer issues the image renewal instruction to activate the second reproducer. On the other hand, when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period, the issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction such that, only in a case of shortening the image reproducing period, the image is renewed by the second reproducer.

On the contrary, Matsumoto and Okabayashi disclose a method that renews an image in either of extending the interval and shortening the interval. Specifically, as admitted by the Examiner, Matsumoto changes the interval at which the displayed image is renewed (page 4, lines 3-5 of the Action). Moreover, Fig. 2 of Matsumoto describes changing of the interval to 50msec, 250msec or 500msec. In either case of extending the interval and shortening the interval, the image is renewed at the changed interval in STEP S15 (column 6, lines 52-55).

Accordingly, Matsumoto is silent regarding the claimed features of “*an issuer for issuing the image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period, such that only in a case of shortening the image reproducing period, the image is renewed in response to the issue of the image renewal instruction.*”

Next, as admitted by the Examiner, Okabayashi discloses a still-picture reproduction period setting section that sets a reproduction period for the still picture image information, and the reproducing section reproduces the identified frame of the still picture image information repetitively for the reproduction period set by the reproduction setting section (see page 4, item 5 of the Action).

Also the Examiner relies on Fig 5B of Okabayashi and alleged that:

Okabayashi teaches the use of a still picture table (fig. 5B). The picture table represents the reproduction speed for the reproducer, the reproducing period ranges from 5 seconds to 0.03 seconds. Since Okabayashi discloses a range of reproduction speeds, it is clear that the change in speed can be extended or reduced (see page 3, second paragraph of the Action dated December 27, 2007).

However, because the reproducing section of Okabayashi merely reproduces the image according to the reproduction period set by the reproduction setting section based on the still picture table of Fig. 5B, in either case of extending the interval and shortening the interval, the image will be renewed in Okabayashi.

Accordingly, Okabayashi is silent regarding the claimed features of “*an issuer for issuing the image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period, such that only in a case of shortening the image reproducing period, the image is renewed in response to the issue of the image renewal instruction.*”

In view of the above, it is submitted that even if, assuming *arguendo*, that Matsumoto may be combined with Okabayashi in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combination would still fail to disclose or fairly suggest the claimed feature of “*an issuer for issuing the image renewal instruction in response to the period changing instruction, wherein said issuer issues the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for shortening the image reproducing period and said issuer stops issuing the image renewal instruction when the period changing instruction is for extending the image reproducing period, such that only in a case of shortening the image reproducing period, the image is renewed in response to the issue of the image renewal instruction,*” as now called for in amended claim 1 and similarly in amended claim 6.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 distinguish over Matsumoto and Okabayashi.

Claims 3-5 are dependent from claim 1 and recite the additional features set forth therein. Accordingly, claims 3-5 also distinguish over Matsumoto and Okabayashi for at least the reasons set forth above.

Application No.: 10/700,518  
Art Unit: 2621

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.114  
Attorney Docket No.: 032085

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Thomas E. Brown  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,450  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/TN/ya